

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Club Z! (Compiled Final Report)

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: varied (see comments on page 5)	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

Provider submitted corrective action plan addressing concerns detailed from initial monitoring visit.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Club Z!

REVIEWERS: ST, MC, & SF

1ST DATE: January 23, 2007/January 26, 2007, **2nd DATE:** April 26, 2007, **3rd DATE:** May 10, 2007, **4th DATE:** May 17, 2007

1ST SITE: Abraham Lincoln Elementary (MSDPT), Thomas D. Gregg School 15 (IPS), **2nd SITE:** IPS #19, **3rd SITE:** Crispus Attucks (IPS), **4th SITE:** IPS #64 (2710 Bethel Avenue)

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 1st site: 7 tutors, 2nd SITE: S.C., J.P., J.H., & I.M., 3rd site: P.B., 4th site: T.M. & J.E.

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 1st site: 4:05pm / 4:40 pm, 2nd SITE: 4:10 p.m., 3rd site: 3:25 p.m., 4th site: 4:40 p.m.

NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 1st site: 6, 2nd SITE: 4, 3rd site: 1, 4th site: 2

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	X		<p><u>Visit #1</u></p> <p>Lessons observed appeared to be connected to students’ classroom work, as tutors used textbooks and curricular materials from the classroom. Club Z’s application states that lessons will mirror what students are working on in their classes; this model was evident. However, it was not always clear that tutors were following their own lesson plans. In addition, in one class, instruction was not often observed and it was not immediately apparent what the lessons were. Students just seemed to work independently on worksheets while the tutor came around and checked the work. Actual instruction in concepts related to the worksheets was not observed.</p>
			<p><u>Visit #2</u></p> <p>Students worked in groups with their tutors and were divided by grade level. The younger students completed homework assignments first and then began their math lesson during which they were given instructions regarding adding or removing manipulatives to find equal, greater than or less than amounts based on the tutor’s directions. In another classroom, students rotated to various stations under the supervision and instruction of their tutors. One station involved students working with a tutor on spelling words or writing the number of syllables in a word on whiteboards, a second station, involved students practicing with math fact cards and then being timed by tutor with how quickly they could progress through the cards (multiplication and addition facts), a third station (“fluency phones”) required students to read out loud a reading passage on laminated paper to practice their speaking and fluency skills, and in a fourth station students retrieved a variety of words from bucket and then practiced alphabetizing them as quickly as they could. In a third classroom, a tutor led a lesson on fractions, ratios, and probabilities. Each student had various manipulatives laid out on a sheet of paper. The tutor then asked questions that required the students to find the ratio of one object compared to another, the probability of finding one object compared to all other objects, and so on.</p>

		<p>Observed lessons are in line with provider application.</p> <p><u>Visit #3</u></p> <p>Most students worked independently on homework assignments in math, reading and science. A few students did “buddy work” once one student completed an assessment. These students had the same homework assignment and worked together while helping each other on problems the other found difficult. The tutor rotated from student to student checking their work and providing assistance when students needed it.</p> <p>Observed lesson was in line with provider application.</p> <p><u>Visit #4</u></p> <p>Students in one room participated in a math lesson led by their tutor. The tutor wrote and drew on a white erase board as they discussed fractions, equal parts, and shapes that were congruent. The tutor also encouraged students to use the paper plates that they had colored earlier as a manipulative to answer various questions about fractions. In addition, students were periodically called to the board to write or draw a response to a math question.</p> <p>In another room, 2 students used large number charts to practice distinguishing between even and odd numbers. One student worked on an educational game and another student worked on a language arts worksheet on categorizing. The tutor rotated from working with the 2 students on odd and even numbers to working with the student on the language arts worksheet.</p> <p>Observed lessons were in line with provider application.</p>
Instruction is clear	X	<p><u>Visit #1</u></p> <p>In most classrooms observed, it was evident that students understood what was expected of them and instruction was generally clear. However, in one classroom, actual instruction was not evident, as it seemed that students worked on worksheets throughout most of the tutoring time observed. When finished with worksheets, students were not always clear on what they were expected to do next, leading them to be off task (see below). Though instruction was generally clear in other classrooms observed, it was not always evident that tutors were following their lesson plans.</p> <p><u>Visit #2</u></p> <p>Tutors appeared to have a good rapport with students which created an encouraging learning environment that allowed tutors to spend more time with students who had difficulty understanding directions or concepts initially. Tutors would often ask students questions to determine their level of understanding and check to make sure students were on point.</p> <p><u>Visit #3</u></p> <p>Tutor rotated from student to student providing assistance and asking questions to ensure that they understood their assignments. Tutor gave examples and coached students when they had difficulty with their assignments. Tutor only moved to the next student when the present student demonstrated understanding of the concepts in the homework assignment.</p>

		<p><u>Visit #4</u></p> <p>The tutor working with students on fractions encouraged students to use manipulatives or work through math problems on the whiteboard to demonstrate their understanding of math concepts on which they were working. When students answered incorrectly, the tutor gave them examples to guide them towards finding the correct answer on their own. For the most part, students in the other room appeared to understand their tutor's instruction (the 2 students working on odd and even numbers did seek clarification multiple times but the tutor was typically able to assist them). However, during the observed lesson, the tutor did not appear to engage the student working on the educational game very much and the focus of his lesson/instruction was unclear to reviewers.</p>
Time on task is appropriate	X	<p><u>Visit #1</u></p> <p>While students were engaged in some of the lessons observed, in a few it seemed that the student/instructor ratio was too large to ensure student engagement. In one class, a group of students was supposed to be working independently on worksheets; however, whenever the tutor's attention was not on them, they were talking about matters unrelated to their worksheets, teasing one another, or getting up and walking around. This group seemed to distract many other students in the classroom. The high student/instructor ratio in this classroom made it nearly impossible for the tutor to ensure and monitor appropriate time on task. In a second observed classroom, the tutor seemed to have difficulty ensuring that all students understood the activity and were on task. In other observed classrooms, time on task was appropriate; two tutors did a very good job keeping students engaged.</p> <p><u>Visit #2</u></p> <p>A few of the younger students had a little more difficulty staying on task but the tutor consistently refocused these students and also praised students paying attention and following directions in order to encourage those who were not to follow suit which worked well. Students in the other classrooms were attentive and engaged throughout their lessons.</p> <p><u>Visit #3</u></p> <p>Students worked diligently on completing their homework. Even the students that did "buddy work" appeared to work well together on completing their assignment.</p> <p><u>Visit #4</u></p> <p>Students in one room were engaged and interacted with their tutor during the lesson. In another classroom, some students were attentive as they completed their lessons but some only focused on their lessons when the tutor was working with them. The tutor redirected these students when they were found to be off task.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X	<p><u>Visit #1</u></p> <p>Instructors were generally knowledgeable of the Club Z program, and all had lesson plans. Again, it was not always evident that instructors were tightly following the plans. In one classroom, the instructor seemed to have difficulty managing the behavior of the students, especially because of the large class size and multiple grades that she had to tutor. Individualized instructional methods were not always evident.</p> <p><u>Visit #2</u></p>

		<p>Although students worked with tutors in small-large groups, tutors were able to individualize instruction for a student by rotating to work with a student when he/she had difficulty grasping a concept. In addition, tutors coached/guided students and encouraged them to use previously learned skills to assist them with answering questions or completing activities rather than simply giving students the answers. Lesson plans related to standards were easily accessible.</p> <p><u>Visit #3</u></p> <p>Tutor seemed familiar with Club Z! protocol and presented lesson plans at beginning of session. Tutor asked students additional questions or asked them to complete additional problems to “test” their knowledge of a concept with which they had previously found difficult. This follow-up was very helpful in ensuring that students fully understood challenging concepts. Tutor also appeared to have a good rapport with students.</p> <p><u>Visit #4</u></p> <p>In many cases, tutors were able to use real world examples to assist students with making a connection between a new concept and something more familiar to them. Also, the tutor in one room encouraged students to explain their answers even when they were correct to ensure that they truly understood concepts. Both tutors coached students or gave them resources to find answers on their own without giving them the answers.</p>
Student/instructor ratio:	X	<p><u>Visit #1</u></p> <p>The student/instructor ratio for small group instruction is supposed to be 2-8:1. However, two classrooms were observed with student/instructor ratios higher than this—9:1 and 11:1 or possibly higher, as the tutor indicated that some students were absent (11 children were observed). According to Club Z!’s application, individualization of instruction and individual attention is key to Club Z’s program. However, it was evident, especially in the larger group, that the high student/instructor ratio made it nearly impossible for the tutor to manage the classroom, ensure appropriate time on task, and appropriately individualize the instruction.</p> <p><u>Visit #2</u></p> <p>Application notes that the ratio will be 8-2:1 and that instruction will be individual or in small groups. A 7-4:1 ratio and small-large group instruction was observed.</p> <p><u>Visit #3</u></p> <p>Application notes that the ratio will be 8-2:1 and that instruction will be individual or in small groups. A 7:1 ratio and small-large group instruction was observed.</p> <p><u>Visit #4</u></p> <p>Application notes that the ratio will be 8-2:1 and that instruction will be individual or in small groups. A 4-3:1 ratio and small-large group instruction was observed.</p>